THE CONDEMNATION OF Monsieur *Du PIN* HIS HISTORY OF Ecclesiastical Authors,

BY THE ARCHBISHOP of PARIS;

Together with his own

RETRACTATION.

Translated out of *French.*

LONDON,

Printed for *Charles Brome* and *William Keblewhite*, at the *East-End* of St. *Paul's*, and at the *Swan* in St. *Paul's Church-Yard*, 1696.

THE

CONDEMNATION

OF

Monsieur Du Pin

HIS

HISTORY

OF

Ecclesiastical Authors,

BY THE

Archbishop of PARIS,

Together with his own

RETRACTATION.

Translated out of French.

LONDON

Printed for Charles Brome and William Kettlewell at the Last Head of St. Paul's, and at the Swan in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1696.

ADVERTISEMENT.

TO *offer any Account of the* History *of* Eccleſiaſtical Writers *by Monſieur* Du Pin, *or to give a Character of it, would be Labour to no purpoſe, ſeeing it is ſo well known here by the accurate* Tranſlation *of it which hath been Publiſhed.*

Monſieur Du Pin's *Performance in that Work, as well as Undertaking, did at firſt receive the Approbation of many Learned* Roman Catholicks, *as they have ſtill the general Applauſe amongſt* Proteſtants : *But the* Eſteem, *which the* latter *had of this Work, tended to the Prejudice of the Author, raiſing Jealouſies in thoſe of his* own Communion, *as if he intended to betray the Church, and to weaken the Foundation upon which it pretends to ſtand. What chiefly recommended him to* Proteſtants *was his Ingenuity, in declaring both his* own *Sentiments, and the Sentiments of the* Fathers. *But this very Thing diſpleaſed the Heads of his* own Church, *where even* Truth *it ſelf is not allowed to be ſpoken but when it may ſerve their* Intereſt. *Nay the more Moderate charged him with* Imprudence *in delivering Truths very* unſeaſonably : *for while they were extirpating the Opinions of* Proteſtants *as damnable* Hereſie, *it was no ways proper to Publiſh a Book which yields great Advantage to* Proteſtants, *and which ſhews that their Sentiments are more agreeable to what the Primitive Church and Fathers held, than the preſent Tenets and Practices of the Church of* Rome. *Theſe*

Prejudices and Objections were managed by ſome who did bear Monſieur Du Pin *a Perſonal Grudge, and by this means he was complained upon publickly, and a publick Cenſure of his Perſon and Books was demanded, which the Circumſtances of the* French *King alſo required and made neceſſary, that thereby he might ſoften the Pope, diſpoſe him to a Reconciliation, and either engage him to ſide with* France *againſt the Confederate Princes, or at leaſt to abide* Neutral. *For it was generally believed, that that Confederacy did firſt ſpring from the Pope, who ſuſpected that the* French *King deſigned to throw off his Authority, and who was highly diſpleaſed with him upon the account of thoſe Propoſitions relating to the Papal Juriſdiction, which the Aſſembly of the Clergy had Concerted and Publiſhed,* Anno 1682.

Thus Policy and Intereſt required the Condemnation of Monſieur Du Pin's *Works, but ſome deſired to ſave himſelf, which could be done no other ways than by a Retractation which he long ſtruggled with, but at laſt was prevailed upon by the Example of the* Gallican *Church, which (it is ſaid) the Archbiſhop of* Paris *urged upon him very much, ſaying, that it was no ſhame for him, a ſingle Perſon, to make a Retractation, when a whole Church had done it, to prevent the inconveniences which might otherwiſe follow.*

The Tranſlator of theſe Works of Monſieur Du Pin, *in his Preface to the Third Volume taketh notice of the Condemnation and Cenſure that were paſt upon them, but alſo ſaith that he was not able to procure either a Copy of them or of* Du Pin's *Retractation, which hath moved me to Publiſh them, believing that they will be acceptable to the Curious, and uſeful to theſe who have bought the Books themſelves, which are not to be the leſs eſteemed becauſe they are thus Condemned. And notwithſtanding*

ſtanding the Author's Retractation it doth appear, that the Proteſtants have Antiquity on their ſide: for as the Retraction was not voluntary, but forced from Du Pin, *ſo it doth not flatly contradict any material point in his Books, but is merely to be conſidered as a Prudent and Political Defence to ſave himſelf from the Conſequences of being judged guilty of what was eſteemed Hereſie.*

Having ſaid that Monſier Du Pin *was prevailed upon to make his Retraction by the example of the* French *Church, who, conſidering the preſent Circumſtances of their King, did alſo Retract the above-mentioned Propoſitions of the Aſſembly* 1682. *which were ſo offenſive to the Pope. I Judge it will not be unacceptable to ſet down their Retraction, which I ſuppoſe is not not very common, and it is as followeth.*

Ad pedes Sanctitatis Veſtræ provoluti, declaramus nos vehementer, & ſupra id quod dici poteſt, ex corde dolore, ſuper rebus geſtis in Comitiis præfatis, quæ Sanctitati veſtræ ejuſque Deceſſoribus valde diſplicuerunt, ac proinde quod ibidem [*circa*] Eccleſiaſticam ac pontificiam authoritatem, ſive in præjudicium Eccleſiarum, quod à mente noſtrâ prorſus alienum eſſe teſtamur, deliberatum decretumque [*videri poteſt*] pro non decreto & non deliberato habemus & habendum eſſe declaramus.

The Pope was not pleaſed with the words circa *and* videri poteſt, *he judged them too ſoft and general, and therefore would not accept of this ſubmiſſion of the Clergy of* France *until they were changed into* contra *and* fuit.

Advertiſement.

It is to be remembered that the Quotations in the following Retractation are marked according to the Engliſh *Tranſlation of* Du Pin's *Works. The Remarks mentioned by* Du Pin *are Critical Obſervations upon his Hiſtory, which were never Tranſlated, nor yet his Anſwers to them, and therefore the Quotations out of them are according to the* Paris *Edition of them.*

An ORDINANCE *of my Lord the Archbiſhop of* PARIS; *containing the Condemnation of a* BOOK *having this Title*; A New Library of Eccleſiaſtical Authors, *&c. By Monſieur* ELLIES Du PIN, *Doctor in Divinity of the Faculty of* Paris. *Printed by* Andrew Pralard.

FRANCIS, by the Grace of GOD, and of the Holy Apoſtolick See, Archbiſhop of *Paris*, Duke and Peer of *France*, Commander of the King's Orders, Proviſor of the Houſe of *Sorbonne*, and Superior of that of *Navarre*; to all who ſhall ſee theſe preſent Letters, Salvation and Bleſſing. It being the Chief Duty of the Paſtors of the Church to keep the Doctrine wherewith they are entruſted, ſuch as they have received from the Apoſtles, whoſe Succeſſors they are, and not to ſuffer any Perſon to make any Change in it without due Cenſure; and as Tradition is the Channel which ſhould convey to us by an uninterrupted Courſe, the Catholick Doctrines in all their Purity, ſo there ſhould be a ſingular Regard had to Books and Authors which pretend to repreſent the ſame entire, deriving it from the Source, and tracing it from Age to Age, even to the preſent Times. We have

have therefore judged that we ought to apply our ſelves carefully to the Examination of a Book printed ſome Years ſince in this City, under the Title of a *New Library of Eccleſiaſtick Authors*, &c. of which there hath already appeared Five Tomes, one after another, divided into ſeven Volumes. The deſign of this Work being to treat of all the Eccleſiaſtick Authors, which have been ſince the firſt Eſtabliſhment of the Church, to Publiſh what they have Written, and to give an Account of their Character and Merit, which the Author profeſſeth to have been performed for the firſt Eight Ages in thoſe Volumes which he hath already publiſhed, intending to continue thoſe which follow until the preſent. And we are ſo much the more concerned to enter upon a narrow Enquiry into this Book; having underſtood that many Perſons do find theſe firſt Tomes full of conſiderable Faults. That nothing in this Affair might paſs without great Deliberation and a perfect Scrutiny, we cauſed this Book to be read by four Doctors in Divinity of the Faculty of *Paris*, who did read all thoſe Tomes, each apart by himſelf, and then conferred a long time together about them, of all which they have given us an exact Account in many Meetings. We have alſo our ſelf examined this Book with all poſſible Attention, and have found that this Work is ſo far from being uſeful to the Church, that it would be on the contrary very prejudicial, if we ſhould allow the Sale of it. Moreover, we deſired to hear the Author's Defences, that ſo we might know his Sentiments and preſent Diſpoſition, for which Cauſe we have granted him as favourable an Audience as was poſſible, for ſeveral Meetings, in the preſence of the ſame Doctors: And as we have found in him an entire Submiſſion to all we ſhould ordain, having put into our Hands a Writing ſigned by

by himſelf, which is annexed to theſe Preſents, in which of the Twelve Articles which we judged chiefly cenſurable in his Book, he doth retract many Propoſitions advanced by him, and teſtifies in general, that he ſubmits himſelf to our Judgment without any reſtriction or reſervation. And as this abſolute Submiſſion (without which we could not think his Writings ſufficient, there being in his Book many Propoſitions cenſurable, which he doth not touch in his Writing) ſecures his Religion, and obliges us to ſpare his Perſon; ſo there remains nothing more to be done, but to give Sentence againſt the Doctrine of his Book. We could have wiſhed that this Work might have deſerved only a limited Cenſure, and ſo would have been ſatisfied to have marked out to the Author ſuch Changes as he ſhould make for ſaving the reſt of it, without proceeding to a full Condemnation, and to an entire Suppreſſion of it. But the Evil being almoſt ſpread through the whole Work, we could not diſpence with the Condemnation of this Book, but are obliged to prohibit the Reading it to all Perſons, whom it hath pleaſed God to ſubmit to our Conduct, for preventing the Prejudice which it might otherwiſe do amongſt People, if ſuch a ſtop were not put to it, that the Church may receive no more Scandal, nor Hereticks get any Occaſion of drawing Advantage againſt the Catholicks. For theſe Reaſons after having implored the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt to beſeech his Guidance of us, we have Condemned, and do Condemn the Book, entituled, *A New Library of Eccleſiaſtick Authors*, &c. by Monſieur *Ellies Du Pin*, Doctor of the Faculty of *Paris*, &c. as containing many Propoſitions falſe, raſh, ſcandalous, offenſive to pious Ears, tending to weaken the Proofs of Tradition about the Authority of the Canonical Books, and many other

Articles

Articles of Faith; Injurious to Oecumenical Councils, to the Holy Apoſtolical See, and to the Fathers of the Church; Erroneous and leading to ſeveral Hereſies. We moſt ſtrictly, and under the Penalties preſcribed by Law, forbid the Reading of this Book to all our Dioceſans of either Sex, or the cauſing or adviſing it to be Read by any Perſon, or having it in their Houſes, or any other where; enjoyning them under the ſame Cenſures, to return them to us as ſoon as poſſible. So we command the Officers of our Eccleſiaſtical Court to ſee the Execution of our preſent Ordinance to cauſe it to be affixed upon the Church Doors of this City and its Suburbs, and in every other place where it ſhall be needful; and alſo to require, if it be neceſſary, the Authority of the Magiſtrates, of whoſe Zeal and Piety we have had Proofs on other Occaſions, to ſtop by all due and reaſonable Methods, the Impreſſion, Sale and Vending hereof. Given at *Paris* in our Archiepiſcopal Palace the *16th.* of *April*, the Year One Thouſand Six Hundred Ninty and Three. Signed, *Francis* Archbiſhop of *Paris*, and a little lower, by my Lord *Wilbault*.

Here followeth the Writing mentioned in this Ordinance, ſigned by the Author of the New Library, *which he gave into the hands of my Lord the Archbiſhop.*

Declara-

Declaration of Monſieur Du Pin.

THere being ſome Perſons, who after the Reading of my Books of the *New Library of Eccleſiaſtick Authors*, have teſtified that they were offended at many places; and thoſe Complaints being carried to my Lord Archbiſhop of *Paris*; who, in Quality of proper Judge of Doctrine, hath taken them into his Conſideration, and named ſome Doctors to ſearch narrowly into this Work, and make a Relation of the ſame to him. I do my ſelf acknowledge by a ſerious Reflection on their Obſervations that there has indeed dropt from me ſome Expreſſions which are hard, obſcure, and that might give ſome Offence to the Reader; ſome alſo which may not be true, and which, againſt my Deſign, may be brought againſt the Truth, for which I ſhall always have a Reſpect, and which I do believe, ought to be maintained in the Church.

This obligeth me, ſeeing my Lord the Archbiſhop hath had the Goodneſs to diſcover the ſame to me in three different Aſſemblies, in which I have not been leſs touched with his Goodneſs and Paternal Charity, than inſtructed by his great and clear Light, in the preſence of the Doctors to whom he committed the Examination of my Book, and with whom he himſelf did Examine it: I ſay, this obligeth me to give, to what is obſcure in that Work, the Illuſtrations which he hath judged, and which I my ſelf have perceived neceſſary, to mollify the Expreſſions which are too hard, and to make an Authentick Declaration concerning thoſe which may bear an Ill Senſe, that it may appear that my Sentiments are Orthodox, and that I have tranſgreſſed only by inadvertency, not ſufficiently con-

ſidering the Terms uſed, nor the Conſequences which might be drawn from them.

To keepthe ſame Order which my Lord the Archbiſhop himſelf obſerved, when he required an Account of all theſe Places.

I. I do firſt acknowledge, as I have always owned for Sacred and Canonical Books, all thoſe which are contained in the Canon of the Council of *Trent*, Seſſ. 4. in all their Parts. I am perſuaded that they were all written by the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt; that it is not lawful in any wiſe to doubt of their Canonicalneſs, after the Deciſion of the Church; and tho' ſome were not received as Canonical at firſt by ſome particular Churches, it is nevertheleſs true that they were owned in the firſt Ages of the Church, for Books of Holy Scripture, and quoted as ſuch by many Fathers. Therefore theſe indefinite Expreſſions in my Book, *The Antient Chriſtians followed the Jewiſh Canon in the Books of the Old Teſtament* (Prel. Diſſert. p. 27.) *they did not own any other Canonical Books of the Old Teſtament, but thoſe which were in the Canon of the* Jews, *Tom.* 1. *p.* 181. ought not to be underſtood generally of all Churches, nor of all the Fathers in the Three firſt Centuries. My Intention being only, tho' my Terms ſeem more general, to diſtinguiſh the Books which have been always received as Canonical through all Churches, and of which there was never any Ground to doubt in any Church, called for this cauſe *Proto-Canonical*, from thoſe who have not always been received as ſuch through all the Churches, and of whoſe Canonicalneſs ſome have doubted, named therefore *Deutero-Canonical*.

I did think that I might hold with *Sixtus Senenſis*, that the Canonicalneſs of the ſix laſt Chapters of *Eſther* might be called in queſtion, and that I might ſay with him, that it was an Addition to the Book of *Eſther*, not comprehended in the Canon of the Council of *Trent*. But ſeeing they have convinced me, that we ought not to apply this Solution to the preciſe Terms of the Council, which admits all theſe Books contained in its Catalogue for Canonical, both in whole, and in all their Parts, as they have been in uſe to be read in the Catholick Church; *Libros integros cum omnibus ſuis partibus prout in Eccleſia legi Catholici conſueverunt*. I have therefore

therefore changed my Sentiment, and do now own them for Canonical, and ſo much the rather, becauſe the Church hath taken out of them Epiſtles and Prayers to be ſaid in its Office; and *Origen*, St. *Auguſtin*, St. *Jerom*, and other Fathers do quote Paſſages out of them. The moſt part of the Reaſons which I formerly brought, do only prove that theſe Chapters have another Author than the reſt of the Book of *Eſther*, except as to ſome apparent Contradictions in Chronology or Hiſtory which may be eaſily reconciled.

II. As to the ſecond Article which concerns Tradition, of which the Fathers are Witneſſes, and their Writings the Channel by which it is conveyed to us. I confeſs that I have forſaken ſome Fathers in Points of Faith, in which I ought to have defended them, as St. *Juſtin* and St. *Irenæus*, concerning the Immortality of the Soul, and the Eternal Puniſhments of the damned, becauſe of two difficult Paſſages which ought to be explained by a great many others, where they do acknowledge the Immortality of the Soul, and the Eternal Puniſhments of the damned, as I have remarked of St. *Juſtin* in the Note *x*, *p.* 54. by quoting the Paſſages of this Father, where he calls the Puniſhments of the damned, Eternal, oppoſing this word Eternal to the Puniſhments which ſhould once have an end: And as we can prove from St. *Irenæus* by many of his Paſſages, and particularly by that of the 47th. Chapter of the Third Book, where he ſaith, That the Puniſhment of thoſe who believe not the Goſpel, is not only Temporal but alſo Eternal; *non ſolum temporalis ſed & æterna.* I have not aſcribed the ſame Sentiment to St. *Hilary*, nor yet to St. *Cyril*; for when I ſaid that St. *Hilary* aſſerted, that *the wicked ſhould be annihilated by the Fire of Hell*, Tom. 2. p. 76. *This*, as this Father ſaith, *is not that they ſhould be totally annihilated, but that they are reduced to an Eſtate which approacheth to nothing*; non in nihilum diſſoluti, ſed in inane ac leve aridumque protriti. And as to St. *Cyril*, I confeſs, that by a miſtake, I have ſlipt into the Verſion of his Paſſage, the Name of Jeſus Chriſt inſtead of that of God, tranſlating *the Soul is immortal becauſe of Jeſus Chriſt who gave it immortality*, where it ſhould be tranſlated, *becauſe of God who gave it immortality*; but I had no intention to aſcribe to him by this, any Error concerning the Immortality of the Soul.

As to Original Sin, I acknowledge it's a Doctrine of Faith which hath always been believed in the Church, it is a Truth of which none ſhall find that I ever doubted, but when I aſſerted, *that St.* Cyprian *was the firſt that had ſpoken very clearly of it*, Tom. 1. p. 142. *that the Fathers of the three firſt Ages ſeem not to be all agreed, whether Children were born in ſin and worthy of damnation*, p. 180. I did not pretend by this, to deny that the firſt Fathers did own it, but I intended only that they had not ſpoke ſo clearly of it as St. *Cyprian*. However, becauſe this may be brought againſt the Tradition of this Doctrine, and that moreover I have found that St. *Juſtin*, St. *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and *Origen*, do ſpeak very clearly of Original Sin; I do declare that I will not maintain theſe Propoſitions, nor inſiſt upon the Anſwers which I have given to the Paſſages of theſe Authors, to prove that they did not teach Original Sin ſo clearly as St. *Cyprian*. I acknowledge alſo, that St. *Chryſoſtom* believed Original Sin, even as St. *Auguſtin* hath explained it ſince, excepting the Puniſhment of Senſe for Children dead without Baptiſm, and that he hath not made this Sin conſiſt in the inclination to Evil only, but alſo in the Guilt which is the Principle of it. In this Senſe is to be underſtood what I have ſaid of the Agreement of his Opinion with that of Divines (*Tom. 3. Part. I. p. 35.*) which I would not oppoſe to that of St. *Auguſtin* as to the main, but only as to the way of ſpeaking; and as to that Puniſhment of Senſe inflicted on Children dead without Baptiſm; I would have it acknowledged, that theſe Two Fathers are entirely agreed as to the main Point of Doctrine, and that both of them taught, that Children were born in Sin, and that they were purged of it by Baptiſm.

I acknowledge that the Name of the Mother of God, which the Church giveth to the Virgin, is of Apoſtolical Tradition, and that it is not only an Expreſſion *Innocent*, but *Sacred* in all times of the Church, and that not only *we may*, but alſo that we ought to call the Virgin the Mother of God, ſeeing ſhe is ſo really; and whereever I have uſed the Term *Innocent* upon the Occaſion of this Name of the Mother of God; I have not intended that it had no more but this Quality, but deſigned to ſhew how far the Obſtinacy and Error of *Neſtorius* reached, who denied, not only that we

we ought to uſe this expreſſion, but even alſo that we might do it lawfully.

I do profeſs to own the Doctrine of Purgatory as it is held in the Church, and as it hath been defined in the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent*, and that it is a Tenet well eſtabliſhed upon the Doctrines of the Fathers of the three firſt Ages, and ſo it muſt not be ſaid Univerſally, as I have done in my Anſwer to the Remarks, P. 61 and 64. *that we find nothing of it poſitively in the Fathers of the firſt three Ages, and that they have not taught, by their Writings, the Doctrine of Purgatory as we have it now.* Expreſſions which I only deſigned in reference to ſome Circumſtances of Purgatory differently explained by Divines, and which ſhould not prejudice the Faith of the Church, nor the Subſtance of the Doctrine Defined in the Council of *Trent*, diſowning whatſoever other Senſe may be put upon it.

What I have ſaid in the Anſwer to the Remarks, P. 144. of the New Syſtem which St. *Auguſtin* formed about Grace and Predeſtination, ought to be underſtood only of the manner how Grace operateth by it ſelf, and of the free Predeſtination for Glory, and of ſome other Queſtions which are ſtill debated amongſt Catholick Divines, about which the Church hath determined nothing; and not of the neceſſity of Grace, which I have acknowledged always to have been believed in the Church, *Ibid.* P. 145. And in the abridgment of the Doctrine of the three firſt Ages. It is true, I have ſaid in one place *that St.* Cyprian *is the firſt who ſpoke very clearly of the neceſſity of the Grace of Jeſus Chriſt*; but I have not pretended that others did not ſpeak clearly of it, ſeeing I my ſelf have remarked, when ſpeaking of the Works of St. *Juſtin*, St. *Irenæus*, St. *Clement*, and many other Fathers, that they taught it. I therefore only intended to ſay that St. *Cyprian* ſpoke of it more ſtrongly and more frequently than any other.

When relating the Sentiments of the *Semipelagians*, I did not ſufficiently diſtinguiſh their Errors, from ſome Catholick Truths, which they alſo Taught, ſuch as the Death of Jeſus Chriſt for the Salvation of all Men, I am therefore obliged to advertiſe that I never intended to confound the one with the other. It has alſo happened in relating diverſe Propoſitions of St. *Auguſtin*, that I have ſometimes uſed Terms,

which

which taken strictly might lead to Error, as taking *free and voluntary for the same thing, and opposing only the necessity of constraint to liberty*; which is very far from my Thoughts, my design being to keep by the Definition of the Church, and the Papal Constitutions received by it.

I acknowledg I was deceived when I said, *That commonly in the three first Ages, they did not give the name of Altar to the Sacred Table, upon which they Celebrated the Eucharist.*

I believe concerning the Sacrament of Penance, That in the Ancient Church they distinguished three sorts of Sins; Crimes great, hainous, and known subjected to Publick Pennance; Sins Venial and very light, which may be remitted by inward Repentance alone; and Sins Mortal less hainous than the first, because Secret, which yet it is necessary to bring under the Discipline of the Church, without which the Remission of a Mortal sin cannot be obtained; for Confession and Absolution are of Divine Institution, and have always been believed necessary for the Remission of all Mortal Sins. So that I disown all the Consequences and contrary Instances, which may be drawn from what I have said of *Publick and dayly Repentance*, Tom. 3. Part 1. Part 2. Tom 2. and when I have said Tom. 5. p. 9. *That Confession of all sorts of Sins was a Pious Practice, very common amongst Christians in the sixth Age.* I do not pretend thereby that it was not in use before for Venial Sins also, but only that the Confessions of these Sins were at that time become more frequent than formerly.

I acknowledg all that is contained in the seventh Canon of the twenty fourth Session of the Council of *Trent*, and even as it is distinguished there: that is to say, the Sentence which Anathematizes those who believe the Church Errs in the Point of the indissolubility of Marriage as an Article of Faith; and that Marriage cannot be so dissolved, even in the case of Adultery, as that it should be lawful for either Party to Marry whilst the other is living, as being a Doctrin received in the Church from the beginning, and which agrees with the Doctrin of the Evangelists and Apostles. And tho there be some Divines, who from the observation of *Palavicin*, upon the Remonstrance of the *Venetian* Ambassadors, occasi-

occaſioned by the *Greeks*, to the Council, while they were forming this Article, do believe that what is ſaid in the Canon, *That the Church hath taught, and doth teach, agreeably to the Doctrin of the Goſpel, and of the Apoſtle concerning the indiſſolubility of Marriage even in the Caſe of Adultery*, is not an Article of Faith, yet I think my ſelf obliged to follow what the Council ſaid. And tho it may be thought that I have ſpoke againſt it, *Tom.* 1. *p.* 182. in my Anſwer to the *Remarks*, p. 71. and in many other places, yet I do declare that I had no deſign of denying that this Doctrin was Evangelical and Apoſtolical, but only to obſerve, that ſome did practiſe contrary thereunto; and if I were to handle this matter over again, I ſhould apply my ſelf as much to prove this Sentiment as I have ſeemed to neglect it.

When I bring in *Jobius* the Monk, ſpeaking of the difference of the Proceſſion of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt, and ſaying, *Tom.* 4. *p.* 37. *That the one is called the Son, and the other the Holy Ghoſt, becauſe ſuch has been the cuſtom, and that Men do expreſs as they can the differences of the Divine Perſons, tho they do not comprehend them*, which Sentiment I have commended. I had no deſign to lay that *difference* merely upon our way of ſpeaking and thinking, as if there was not a very real one, and altogether independent from our Thoughts and Expreſſions, betwixt the Generation of the Word and the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt; the firſt of which is truly a Generation, and the other is not, but only the mind of Man can neither conceive nor imagin wherein it conſiſts.

I had no Reaſon to commend that of *Socrates* as a judicious Obſervation, when he ſaith, that the Queſtion *About the day of the Celebration of* Eaſter *was of ſmall Conſequence*, ſeeing the Church hath made it a Capital Head of Diſcipline.

III. As to the third Head which concerns Councils, I do proteſt that I have always had in my Heart a ſincere and true reſpect, ſuch as every Catholick ought to have, for Councils, and I have conſidered the Decrees of General Councils, in Matters of Doctrin, as Articles of Faith. I have always acknowledged the advantage, and alſo on ſome occaſions the neceſſity of aſſembling them; being perſuaded

that

that this is the moſt proper and moſt effectual means, and ſometimes alſo neceſſary to ſuppreſs Error, to eſtabliſh the Catholick Doctrin, and to remedy the diſorders and abuſes which the Enemies of the Church would introduce into the world. Thus, Councils in themſelves muſt always have a good end, and produce good effects: but it happens ſometimes through the malice of Men, and the obſtinacy of Hereticks, that they do not preſently give Peace, but Debates continue, and the Enemies of the Church oppoſe their Violence and Error to Juſtice and Truth, which nevertheleſs hath always the Victory in the end, by the particular Protection which God gives to his Church, againſt which the Gates of Hell, that is to ſay, Hereſies and Errors ſhall never prevail. It is in this Senſe that I would have underſtood what I have ſaid, *viz. That it is very ſeldom that General Councils, held upon matters of Faith, procure the Churches Peace by their determination.* Which is not, becauſe Councils are not a means of Peace, or do not always eſpouſe the Party which they ought to take, but it is through the blindneſs and fury of Hereticks, who, being incenſed and confounded to ſee themſelves juſtly condemned, do their utmoſt endeavours againſt the Orthodox Doctrin Eſtabiſhed infallibly; as I fully explained it by the inſtances of the *Arians*, and of the Adverſaries of the Councils of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*. But notwithſtanding all the Attacks and Oppoſitions of Hereticks, the Definitions of Councils are the Rule of Faith, and all thoſe who will not acknowledge them are without the Church, all Catholicks ſhould ſubmit unto them, and all thoſe who do not ſubmit are Hereticks. So that the Church is at Peace within it ſelf, and is only troubled from without by the Perſecution, the Attacks, and Violence of thoſe who are not of it. It is thus that I would have my words taken, having never had any intention to maintain, nor even to ſay, that after the Definition of Faith by a General Council, thoſe who do not ſubmit to it could belong to the Church.

The diſtinction which I have uſed in many places, *Tom.* 1. of *Articles Fundamental and not Fundamental, Principal and not Principal*, is very different from the Senſe which Hereticks give to theſe Terms; for by *Articles Fundamental and Principal*, I underſtand thoſe which we are obliged to believe Expli-

Explicitely, or which are contained in the Creed and not in the Senſe of Hereticks, who pretend that there may be Articles framed by the Church which may be denied.

Tho I believe not that I have given any occaſion of doubting the Orthodoxy of my Faith concerning *the Hypoſtatical Union of the two Natures in Jeſus Chriſt*; however, becauſe a Catholick Doctor cannot be far enough from all ſort of ſuſpition of Hereſie, I proteſt before God, that I do believe firmly that there are in Jeſus Chriſt two Natures, united in one only Perſon by an Hypoſtatical Union, to wit, the Divine Nature and the Humane; that Jeſus Chriſt is both true God, and true Man together, and that I am ready to defend this Catholick Truth even to the laſt drop of my blood. That I do Anathematize the Error of *Neſtorius*, his Perſon, and Party, and that I have a ſincere and true reſpect for the Holy Council of *Epheſus*. And becauſe ſome have judged, that without any deſign, there has eſcaped me, in my Relation, things which may give a diſadvantageous Idea of that Affair, and Omitted Matters of Fact which may be to its advantage. I thought it my duty to make here a ſhort review for taking away all occaſion of Scandal and Complaint. Having ſaid, Tom. 3. Part 2. p. 191. *That St.* Cyril *did advertiſe the Monks of* Egypt, *that it were better not to move theſe kinds of abſtracted queſtions, which could not be of any uſe.* This ought not to be applied to the Defenders of the Catholick Doctrin againſt *Neſtorius*, but to that Heretick and his Party who excited theſe Debates, by ſowing their Novelties, and publiſhing their Errors.

That Expreſſion which I uſed, *p.* 192. *viz. St.* Cyril *fearing that thoſe of his Party:* having given occaſion to ſome to think that I did conſider St. *Cyril* as the Head of a Party like to that of *Neſtorius*, this obligeth me to declare that there is nothing farther from my Thought, and that on the contrary I do conſider St. *Cyril* as a Defender of the Catholick Doctrin, and *Neſtorius* as the Head of a Hereſie. And therefore if any think, that the word **Party** cannot be taken in a good Senſe, I beg Pardon for having uſed it in that place, and elſewhere, declaring that it was never my Thought to compare or to put into the Ballance the Cauſe of the Church, of which St. *Cyril* was the Defender, with that of *Neſtorius*, who

was in Hereſie. I forgot to advertiſe, that the Reproaches, contained in the Letter of the Emperor to St. *Cyril*, related *p.* 195. were not true, and that this Prince was ſurpriſed by the Enemies of this Saint.

I have obſerved in two different places, *p.* 195. and *p.* 214. That the Council was lawfully held before the arrival of thoſe from the Eaſt, ſeeing the time of its Indiction was paſſed, and that they themſelves believed that they might begin it without them. I add now, that as the Letter of St *Cyril* to the Emperor imports, they could not put off the Council longer, becauſe there were Biſhops who could not ſtay longer in a Country ſo far from their own; that many Biſhops were in danger of dying, becauſe the Air of *Epheſus* did not agree with them; that ſome were already Dead, and that all demanded that the Council might be held as ſoon as poſſible. Having obſerved, *p.* 196. *That the Biſhops did aſſemble themſelves, altho the Legats from the Holy See were not come, and notwithſtanding the oppoſition of threeſcore and eight Biſhops*, yet I intended not by this to inſinuate, that they were in the wrong for aſſembling themſelves; nor that there was any regard due to that oppoſition. As to the number of the Biſhops of the Council, having ſaid *That the Subſcriptions prove one hundred and ſixty.* I juſtifie ſufficiently what the Council ſaith, *viz.* That they were near two hundred, and do ſhew the falſhood of what is alledged by the Eaſterns that they were only fourſcore.

P. 196. Having related that *Candidian* ſaid, *That he had read his Commiſſion againſt his will*; it muſt be remarked, that this bribed Officer is not to be believed in this matter, and that 'tis only a pretence which he hath ſince invented.

P. 197. Having related all that paſſed in the firſt Seſſion of the Council of *Epheſus*: I had no intention to accuſe that Council of Precipitation in its Judgment; and I do acknowledge truly that there was none, becauſe the matter was wholly prepared, and, as I have ſaid elſewhere, 'tis evident that *Neſtorius* was in an Error.

When I ſaid, *That there were in the Subſcriptions of the Letters from the Eaſterns more than fifty Biſhops, tho St.* Cyril *only obſerves thirty ſix.* I intended not to accuſe *St.* Cyril of falſhood, but it may be that the Eaſterns might get

get ſome Biſhops, who were not preſent, to ſign afterwards.

All that is ſaid by *Candidian* deſerves no Credit, being related by a Man ſuſpected and Bribed: nor ought we to give any more Faith to what the Eaſterns write in their Letters, nor to what *Acacius* of *Berea* ſaith of the Corruption of the Emperors Officers by *John* the Phyſician, and Friend of St. *Cyril*, of which I have ſpoken.

Having ſaid *That the event of what paſſed at* Epheſus, *was, if I may ſo ſay, under the Power of the Emperor, and that the ſucceſs of the Council depended upon the Reſolutions the Court ſhould take*, I did not thereby intend, that the Definition of the Council of *Epheſus*, and the Condemnation of *Neſtorius* depended on the Will of the Emperor, as to the Right and Obligation of ſubmitting thereto, but only as to the External Execution and Publication. For it muſt have happened, if the Emperor had continued to be deceived, that he would have Perſecuted the Catholicks, oppoſed the Truth, and protected Violence and Error for ſometime; but this is nothing to the Validity of the Council, or the Solidity of its Deciſion, which no ways depended on the Judgment of the Emperor, nor on the Reſolutions of the Court.

Having ſaid *P.* 201. *That the Emperor conſented to the deprivation of* Neſtorius, *and to that of St.* Cyril *and* Memnon, *becauſe of their Caballing*. I deſigned not to approve this Conduct of the Emperor, nor to accuſe St. *Cyril* of Caballing, but only to mark, that the Emperor was prepoſſeſſed falſly by *Acacius* of *Berea*, that St. *Cyril* and *Memnon* had Caballed together.

Tho it ſeems to me, that I have given very ſolid Anſwers to the Objections, which I have brought againſt the Council of *Epheſus*; nevertheleſs, becauſe ſome have been offended at the Objections, I agree with them, that I had done better not to have related them in a *French* Book. We may alſo add to the Anſwers, that there was nothing done in the Council with Precipitation. That all the Matter was prepared and diſcuſſed beforehand. That St. *Cyril* held it not only at the time when it ought to have been held, but that it was morally impoſſible to delay it. That the Zeal which actuated this Father was commendable and according to knowledge. That there came Biſhops from the fartheſt parts who arrived much before *John* of *Antioch*. That 'tis certain that *John* of *Antioch*

tioch designed not to come to the Council; and that he was very glad to have it begun, that he might have a pretext for keeping away from it. That *Nestorius* was sufficiently convinced out of his own Writings of not admitting a real and Hypostatical Union in Jesus Christ. That there is no regard to be had to the Judgment of *Isidorus Dam.* who only spoke by confused Reports. That the Error of *Nestorius* was so evident, and so horrible, that it was just to Condem it in such Terms as might denote the horror which we ought to have for his Heresie, such as these, *Nestorius* another *Judas*, *Tom.* 3. *Part* 2. *p.* 214. That they did examin carefully, and related faithfully the Extracts of *Nestorius*'s Books in this Synod; and lastly, that all was transacted there Legally and Canonically. As to the Sentiment of *Nestorius*, it is true that he never durst openly say, that there were two Christs and two Persons, but he said what was equivalent, denying the Hypostatical Union of the two Natures, admitting only a Moral Union betwixt them, as appears by a great many passages in his Writings. He held not the Error of *Paulus Samosatenus*, and of *Arius* concerning the Divinity of the Word, who did not admit of any Union of the Divine Nature with the Human, as Father *Garner* hath observed before me, but he erred expressly, and in formal Terms, concerning this Union, admitting only, betwixt the two Natures, an Union Moral and Apparent, and not Real and Substantial: of which Error it was easie to convince him by his Writings, tho he disguised it in some places. So when I say. *Tom.* 3. *Part* 2. *p.* 42. *That if we appeal to his Writings, it doth appear that he hath maintained, that the Word was united with the Humane Nature by a very intimate and strict union.* However, this is not to to be understood of his true Sentiment, nor of all that he hath said, but only of some places in which he hath affected, as Hereticks do, the use of Catholick Terms. For in many other places he discovers visibly his Error, as I have marked *Page* 43. *p.* 215. and if their be any Expressions in my Work which may give another Idea of him, I declare that 'tis against my intention, and I do beseech the Reader to take them in this Sense. And when I said *p.* 42. *That he always said that he could not own that God was born, that God suffered, that God died, and that his Error* con-

conſiſted only in this; I in no wiſe pretend to make it conſiſt only in the refuſal which he made of theſe Expreſſions, acknowledging that he did really admit a Moral Union betwixt the two Natures, and that he would have two Perſons in Jeſus Chriſt, which was the reaſon why he would not admit the Conſequences of the Unity of one Perſon alone.

Theſe words in the beginning of the Hiſtory of the Council of *Chalcedon*, *Tom.* 3. *Part* 2. *p.* 230. *That this Aſſembly had turned into a confuſed Rout, if the Commiſſaries of the Emperor had not put a ſtop to the tumultuary Exclamations which were made there, by advertiſing the Biſhops that it was unworthy of them to behave themſelves after ſuch a manner.* I ſay, theſe words not appearing reſpectful enough to that Council which I honour, I wiſh I had not uſed them, tho' I did it innocently, and without any bad intention.

When I ſaid, *Tom.* 4. *pag.* 146. *That it had been better not to have moved the affair of the three Chapters*, I deſigned that this Cenſure ſhould only fall upon what preceded the time of the Council, and on the Perſon of *Theodorus*, who ſtirred up *Juſtinian* to puſh on this Affair. As to the Council, I acknowledge that as Affairs ſtood then, and ſeeing how far the Aſſembly was carried on, that it was abſolutely neceſſary for the good of the Church to paſs the Condemnation of the three Chapters, and that all the Catholicks ought to have ſubmitted to it; that they had reaſon to condemn *Theodorus* after his Death, and that that Conduct of Anathematizing the Dead may be followed, as the Church hath often done ſince; that they had reaſon alſo to condemn the Letter of *Ibas*, and the Writings of *Theodoret*, thus I diſown what I have ſaid to the contrary, *p.* 146. and what follows.

As to the matter of *Images*, the Worſhip of which is determined in the ſecond Council of *Nice*. I acknowledge that this Council is a General and Lawful one, and that therefore there is a perfect ſubmiſſion due to it, acknowledging for an Article of Faith all which it hath decreed, and that all its Proofs are not drawn from ſuppoſed Monuments, and Apocryphal Paſſages of the Scripture and Fathers which prove nothing; that there are there very ſolid Proofs and unanſwerable, drawn either from Scripture, or the Writings of the Fathers, or other Pieces of Antiquity. I did not intend to

make

make any compariſon betwixt this Council and the falſe Council of *Conſtantinople* againſt *Images*, nor to ſpeak of them as two oppoſite Parties. I believe very firmly in the one, what I deteſt in the other, acknowledging with the firſt, a Worſhip Relative, True and Sincere to be paid to *Images*, out of Reſpect to what they repreſent, according as it is explained in the Council of *Trent*. And when I ſaid, *Tom.*5. *p.*146. *That Image-worſhip was eſtabliſhed by the ſimpler and weaker ſort, who ſeeing the Saints drawn upon Tables for the Inſtruction of thoſe who could not read, could not forbear to teſtify by external Signs, the Veneration which they had for the things they repreſented; and that this worſhip of Images thus eſtabliſhed, was moreover fortified by the Miracles which were aſcribed to them.* I did not intend that this was the only Origin of the worſhip of Images, nor the reaſon of the Progreſs which it made, which was eſtabliſhed and approved by the Church for very good Reaſons; and I do acknowledge, that to give it no other Origin, nor any other Progreſs than this, ſhould be to leſſen the Reſpect we have for them, and very far from promiting it as I ought.

What I have ſaid, *page* 147. *That we cannot condemn as Hereticks, thoſe who will not admit Image-worſhip for ſome particular Reaſons, either becauſe the Practice of their Church is otherways, or becauſe they fear theſe outward Duties ſhould be miſtaken for Adoration*; or Laſtly, *Becauſe they do not believe the Worſhip of Images to be ſufficiently warranted, ſeeing to prove it they have alledged a great number of falſe Pieces, or of impertinent Paſſages that prove nothing.* And what I have ſaid in the ſame place, *Moreover the proceeding of thoſe Perſons could not be blamed, who to ſettle Peace in the Church, and to re-unite two oppoſite Parties; of which, the one were for breaking down all Images, and the other for honouring of them, endeavouring to make their own uſage to be received every where, and wrote to the Pope reſpectfully about it.* I ſay, theſe are Expreſſions which have eſcaped me, which I wiſh I had not uttered; becauſe beſides that, they are too indefinite, and that taking them in the ut-moſt extent, they may give ground to think that we ought not at this time to condemn any who ſhould refuſe by ſome one of theſe Reaſons to honour Images, tho' my intention was to apply them only to the Church of *France* in the time of *Charlemain*, to which I have afterwards

afterwards fixed them. Beſides this, they may give occaſion to think that we may conſider the *Iconoclaſts*, as a Party tolerated in the Church, and whom the *French* did not condemn as Hereticks, tho' it be certain that theſe Enemies of the Orthodox Faith have always been looked upon as ſuch by all Catholicks, and that it is certain that the *Iconoclaſts* and *Claudius* of *Turin*, who was of their Sentiment, were conſidered as Hereticks, even by thoſe of our *French* who did not own the Adoration of Images. Therefore leſt my words be ſo taken, I am here obliged to ſay, that I never believed that theſe very Perſons, who do not yet acknowledge the Second Council of *Nice* for lawful, ſhould conſider the *Iconoclaſts* as being within the Church, or that they ſhould tolerate them in it. And when I ſaid, *p.* 133. *That the Emperor* Conſtantine Copronimus *deſigned to have his Diſcipline received every where*, ſpeaking of his Deſign to break down Images, I did not underſtand it of the Heretical Doctrine of the *Iconoclaſts*, nor did I intend that it ſhould be thought no Hereſy to uſe Images after that manner.

When I ſaid, *p.* 148. *That it were fitting to ſuffer no Image of the Deity and Trinity*, I did not intend to condemn theſe Images, and I have ſpoken too generally, *that all the moſt zealous Defenders of Images have condemned them*, which is only to be found in ſome. I do acknowledge that the Celibacy of Prieſts and Deacons is a Practice very Holy and moſt Praiſe worthy, commonly obſerved in the Church from the firſt three Centuries: and I did not intend to ſay any thing to the contrary, *Tom.* 1. *p.* 183. *Tom.* 2. *p.* 248, *&c.*

IV. As to the fourth Article which concerns *the Primacy of the Holy See*, I ought to have collected with more Care what the Councils, the Fathers, and other Eccleſiaſtical Authors have ſaid of the *Primacy of the Holy See*, and of the Greatneſs of the Church of *Rome*, and to have taken occaſion to remark to the Reader the extent of this Primacy, its Divine Inſtitution, and its Juriſdiction in all the Church, without doing prejudice to the true Priviledges of particular Churches, and to the Rights of Biſhops. This did not happen becauſe I do not believe, or have not always believed this Primacy of Juriſdiction over all the Church to be of Divine Inſtitution

Inſtitution, as I have obſerved it, *Tom.* 2. *p.* 90. and elſewhere, in theſe very Terms, *The Biſhop of the Church if* Rome *was in poſſeſſion of the Primacy, which he received from Jeſus Chriſt, as being Succeſſor of St.* Peter, *Prince of the Apoſtles: This Primacy was given him with great Priviledges and great Prerogatives in all the Church, for maintaining in it the Faith, and for cauſing the Holy Canons to be obſerved.* But I ſhould have inſiſted more upon it, and ought to have ſpoken of it oftner, to confirm it by greater Proofs, and not to have neglected the doing of this as I may ſeem to have done, either by omitting very fair Paſſages of Antiquity upon this Head, or not giving theſe Paſſages all their force in my Tranſlations; as when I bring the Paſſage of the 53 Epiſtle of St. *Cyprian* to Pope *Cornelius*, I have omitted theſe words; *Nec cogitare eos eſſe Romanos quorum fides Apoſtolo predicante laudata eſt, & ad quos perfidia habere non poſſit acceſſum*, and to ſome other Paſſages which are of the ſame Subject. Speaking of the Condemnation of *Neſtorius* by the Council of *Epheſus*, I have tranſlated theſe words, *Coacti per ſacros Canones & Epiſtolam Celeſtini, thus we have been conſtrained according to the Letter of* Celeſtine, which ought to have been literally tranſlated thus, *We have been conſtrained by the Holy Canons, and by the Letter of* Celeſtine. As alſo the Council of *Calcedon* ſpeaking of the re eſtabliſhment of *Theodoret* in his Biſhoprick by Pope St. *Leo*; I have uſed an Expreſſion which doth not give the Terms of the Council all their force; for, *reſtituit ei Epiſcopatum*, is tranſlated thus, *he owned him for Biſhop.*

When I ſaid in the Advertiſement of *Tom.* 5. *That the miſſions ſerved to enlarge the Authority of the Pope*; theſe words ought to be underſtood of the actual extent of his Juriſdiction, and not of his right of Primacy.

When I made mention of the Complements, *Tom.* 3. *Part* 1. and *Part* 2. which St. *Auguſtin* and *Theodoret* gave to the greatneſs of the Church of *Rome*, when writing to the Popes, I did not deſign Complements which are not founded upon Truth, but do acknowledge that theſe Praiſes are very true.

I cannot but diſapprove the Liberty which I have taken to ſpeak of ſome Holy Popes with very little reſpect, and amongſt

amongſt others, of Pope St. *Cornelius*, whom I have too much accuſed of *Weakneſs* in the Defence of St. *Cyprian*; of Pope St. *Stephen*, whom I have taxed with *exceſſive Paſſions, Heat*, and *Fiercenſs*. Tom. 1. p. 118, *&c.* and of whom I ſaid, *That it was very probable that he fell into the Error of Re-baptizing all Hereticks, however they had been baptized*; of Pope *Zoſimus*, by ſaying, *That he had a deſign to enlarge his Authority, for which cauſe it was that he entered upon the defence of* Celeſtius; of St. *Innocent*, by obſerving *that he was very jealous of the Greatneſs and Authority of the Church of* Rome, *and very tenacious of his Rights, and that he wrote tolerably well*; of St. *Leo*, of whom I ſaid, *Tom. 3. Part 2. p. 110. That he ſought all occaſions to ſhew his Authority*; and of what I may have ſaid in ſome other places.

V. As to the fifth Article, which concerns Hereſy and Hereticks, I may in ſome places have ſpoken of them, tho' contrary to my intention, in ſuch a manner as does not ſeem to beget a due averſion to them, and which doth not ſufficiently preſerve the Reader, treating too gently thoſe who furthered or ſupported them. I wiſh I had not ſaid of *Euſebius That we cannot refuſe him the Quality of a Saint without raſhneſs*, after having aſſerted *that he never approved the Term Conſubſtantial, altho' he eſtabliſhed a perfect equality betwixt the Father and the Son.*

I did only tranſlate the Paſſage of *Gennadius* about *Vigilantius*, and as he ſaid, *That this Man had advanced Frivola*, I have heedleſly tranſlated this Term by *Bagatels*, tho' it may bear another ſignification, and point out Errors which have no foundation: But I do not pretend by this, any ways to excuſe *Vigilantius* from Errors which he hath advanced againſt the Invocation of Saints, and the Veneration of Relicks, nor yet to approve wholly the Sentiment of *Gennadius*.

VI. As to the Sixth Article which concerns *the Adverti-ſements which I have given to the fourth and fifth Tome.* I acknowledge that in the *three firſt Pages* there are Expreſſions very hard, and if they be taken literally and generally, and not according to my Intention, they are capable of offend-

ing Pious Persons, therefore I wish these Pages were torn out. But however Protestantss would be in the wrong to draw from them any Consequence to the prejudice of the Church, which I do acknowledge immoveable in her Faith and in her Manners, tho' she may change in her Discipline. I do acknowledge in particular, that to celebrate the *Mass* every Day, is a practice Holy and Commendable which I never design to disapprove no more than the frequent Confession of Venial Sins.

VII. As to the seventh Head which concerns the Fathers, I acknowledge that I have spoke of some of them in Terms which testify too little respect for them; as relating, *Tom. 1. p.* 60. The Judgment of *Photius* upon the Works of St. *Irenæus*, where I should have remarked, that what *Photius* said in this place had a respect to other Works than those we now have. It seems to me that I have drawn the Picture of *Novatian* too favourably, and that that of Pope St. *Cornelius* is not favourable enough. I cannot approve of what I have said of St. *Gregory Nazianzen, That he had much Piety, but little Conduct and Policy in Business; that he undertook readily great Matters, but repented himself presently of having undertaken them; that he had in his Life-time there Bishopricks, and nevertheless it cannot be said that he was lawful Bishop of any one; that his Humour was Chagrine and Satirical; that he loved Raillery and spared no body.* I wish I had not said of St. *Epiphanius, that he had no Judgment, nor Conduct, nor Policy.* As I approve of what I say of St. *Jerome, that he was without doubt the most learned of all the Fathers,* so I disapprove of what I said afterwards, *p.* beginning with these words; *that he turned his Adversaries into ridicule,* &c. When I said of *Severus Sulpitius, that he was too credulous of Miracles*; and of St. *Paulinus, that he was too much inclined to believe Miracles, and to have a veneration for Relicks.* I did not design to obstruct the Belief of Miracles well confirmed, nor the Veneration due to Relicts well attested. By what I have said of St. *Augustin*, it doth appear how much I esteem this Father, whom I own to be one of the greatest Doctors of the Church, and most observant of Tradition, which he hath only illustrated in all that he hath written concerning the Doctrines of Faith, therefore it should not be taken in ill

part

part what I have ſaid, *p.* *Tom.* 3. *Part* 1. *that he very often runs away from the Sentiments of thoſe who preceded him to follow a way altogether New, whether in the Explication of Scripture, or in the Opinions of Divinity.* Here I did not underſtand Matters of Faith, but ſome Queſtions which are only regarded by Divines as ſimple Opinions. In the Character which I have given of this Father, there may be Expreſſions which are very hard above all in theſe Pages.

I have ſpoke with very little reſpect of St. *Cyril* his ſtile and manner of Expreſſion, when I ſaid, *Tom.* 3. *Part* 2. *p.* and *that it is eaſy to write great quickly Volumes of this nature*, &c. And to what I have obſerved of him to his diſadvantage drawn from *Photius*, I ſhould have added what the ſame Author ſays in his favour, *that he preſſed Hereticks ſo ſtrongly by Texts of Scripture, and by Logical Reaſonings, that they knew not where to turn themſelves.* I have teſtified ſufficiently the Reſpect and Eſteem which I have for St. *Leo*; and when I ſaid, *that he was not very fertile upon the points of Morality, which he treated very drily, and after a manner which rather diverted than affected.* I deſigned only to mark that he did not treat Matters of Morality ſo largely and ſo much as other Fathers, tho' I do acknowledge that his Sermons are very uſeful, and his manner of expreſſing things as capable to perſuade as to pleaſe.

In the Elogy which I have given to St. *Chryſologus*, I ſhould have ſtopt at what I ſaid, *p.* without adding, *that he had nothing great or high to merit the Name of* Chryſologus. When I ſaid, ſpeaking of the Book of the *Celeſtial Hierarchy*, and of that of *Myſtical Divinity*, *that nothing ſolid, profitable, or agreeable could be drawn from them*; I have ſpoken ſo only in reference to Popular Inſtructions, acknowledging that there are in this Book things very good and very profitable for Divinity.

Finally, if there be any other place in my Hiſtory which may be contrary to the reſpect due to the Holy Fathers, or any Terms which may be conſtrued to their diſadvantage, it is againſt my Intention.

VIII. As to the Eighth Article, which concerneth Penitentials, Caſuiſts, and Scholaſtick Divines; what I have ſaid of the two firſt in the Advertiſement of the 5 *Tom. p.* I did not

mean of all Penitentials, nor of all Caſuiſts acknowledging that there are of them who are profitable and good. As alſo when I ſaid in my anſwer to the *Remarks*, *that Scholaſtick Divines would forget nothing of all that might have a reference to their Metaphyſical Queſtions, whereas theſe good Divines*, &c. I intended not here to oppoſe good Divines to good Scholaſticks, but only to thoſe Scholaſticks who inſiſt too much upon ſubtile Queſtions and Logical Difficulties, without applying themſelves to the Study of the Scriptures and Tradition, acknowlegding, that there are good Scholaſtick Divines and that this Science is uſeful.

When I ſaid, that St. *Thomas quoted Fathers careleſly, and with little Judgment*, I intended only that this Saint, as well as many Writers of his time, did not quote the Authors with any critical exactneſs, which was the Effect of the Age he lived in, rather than a perſonal Fault.

IX. As to the Ninth Article which concerns *the Extracts I have given of Authors*; it is true, that I have not ſet my ſelf ſufficiently to diſtinguiſh what is good from what is amiſs in them, nor to anſwer the difficult Paſſages for enabling the Readers how to guard themſelves.

X. As to the Tenth Article, which concerneth *Critical Queſtions*, I own that we ought to regard the *Apoſtles Creed* as a formulary of Faith, drawn up by them as to the Subſtance, tho' ſome Terms were not the ſame in all Churches And as to the *Inſtitution of Lent*, that we ought to ſay with St. *Leo*, St. *Jerom*, and other Fathers, that it is of Apoſtolical Inſtitution, and that the Paſſages, which I have related, do not prove the contrary.

XI. As to the Eleventh Article, which concerneth Miracles, Revelations, Apparitions, and pious Practices; when I ſaid that t was ſurpriſing, *that* Euſebius *never ſpoke of the Invention of the Croſs*; I did not intend by this to call in queſtion this Matter of Fact which is atteſted by contemporary Authors, nor to doubt of the Miracles which they have telated, of which I ought to have ſpoken more confidently than I have done, *Tom.* 2. *Part.* 1. *p.* as well as of the Revelation made to St. *Cyprian* to retire, *Tom.* 1. *p.* And of the Miracle of Healing of *Leo* III. related by *Anaſtaſius* the Library Keeper, *Tom.* 5. *p.* Speak-

Speaking of the Wax Candles which they light in honour of the Martyrs, and relating a paſſage of St. *Jerom*, Tom. 3. Part 1. p. When I remarked *That in the times of this Father it was not the cuſtom to light them at Noon*, I intended not to blame the preſent Cuſtom of the Church, nor to take from it the Authority which it hath from Antiquity. It muſt be added that St. *Jerom* does not condemn thoſe who lighted Wax Candles at Noon out of Devotion, and he teſtifies that they did it in the Eaſt in all Churches while the Goſpel was a reading.

XII. Finally, As to the laſt Head, which concerneth ſome paſſages, where I ſeem not to have comprehended the Senſe of the Authors; I make no difficulty of acknowledging that this may have happened many times, it being very hard not to be deceived in ſo great a Work, and to keep always an equal application in reading ſo many great Volumes. But as I have only done it through inadvertency, ſo I ſhall be always obliged to thoſe who will advertiſe me of it, and be ready to ſet me right.

In particular, I do acknowledg that, *Tom. 3. Part 2. p. 52.* I have ill underſtood the Sentiment of *Philoſtorgius* on the Second Book of *Maccabees*, who doth not ſay that it is *of leſs Authority than the Firſt*, but of *another Author*. That *Hipatius* doth not ſay in the Conference with the *Severians*, *That we muſt not regulate our ſelves by what every Apoſtle hath Written and Practiſed concerning the Obſervation of Legal Ceremonies, but only by what every one hath Practiſed.* That the paſſage of *Caſſian* related *Tom. 3. Part 2. p. 13* ſhould not be underſtood of the *Law and Obligation to obſerve Lent*, but of the Reaſon of its Inſtitution. That St. *Jerom* ſaid not in the one hundred and twenty ninth Letter *That ſome Churches, both* Greek *and* Latin *received not the Epiſtle to the* Hebrews, *nor the* Revelation, but only that ſome *Latin* Churches did not receive the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* no more than ſome *Greek* Churches the *Revelation*, notwithſtanding that it is authorized by the Teſtimony of the Antients, and after this manner the Extract of that Letter muſt be rectified, *p. Tom. 3. Part 1.* Behold the principal things which have been obſerved to me; if there be yet any other thing in my Works which cauſes any difficulty,

I ſhall

I ſhall he always ready to clear it, to change it, to correct it, and even to revoke it, if need be; my only deſign, in Writing, being to ſeek the Truth, and to Edifie the Church. I acknowledge with St. *Auguſtin*, that it is a great favour which God doth to Authors, when he giveth them the means of rendering their Works more learned and more exact, by the Cenſures of thoſe who read them and examin them; and I do very readily apply to my ſelf theſe words; *Ego autem cum per eos qui meos labores legunt non ſolum doctior verumetiam emendatior fio, propitium mihi Deum agnoſco, & hoc per Eccleſiæ Doctores maxime expecto, ſi & in ipſorum manus venit, dignanturque noſſe quod ſcribo.* St. Aug. *De dono Perſ. circa finem.* But I do conſider it as the greateſt happineſs which could befal me, to have for my Judge the moſt able and learned Prelate of the Kingdom, to whoſe Judgment I ſhall ever think it my glory to ſubmit, as I am obliged to it, without Reſtriction and without Reſervation.

Signed L' Ellies Du Pin *with his own Hond.*
By Monſeigneur Wilbault.

An Extract out of the Regiſters of the Parliament of Paris, Saturday, April, 25. 1693.

THIS day the Kings Council entered the Court, and by *Monſieur Chreſtien Francois de la Moignon*, Advocate to our Lord the King, did acquaint them, that they thought it was their Duty to inform them, that the Archbiſhop of *Paris* had lately Condemned a Book Entituled *Novelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques*, written by Monſieur *Ellies Du Pin*, Doctor in Divinity of the Faculty of *Paris*, becauſe it contained Propoſitions contrary to ſound Doctrin. That the Cognizance of every thing that relates to the Faith, belonging to the Church, and the deciſion of theſe Matters to the Biſhops within their reſpective Dioceſe. The ſuppreſſion of the Books which they Condemn, and the afflictive puniſhment of thoſe who perſiſt in Opinions which haue been Cenſured

Cenſured by the Biſhops, belongs to the King's Officers, and chiefly to this Court, which is the Depoſitory of Sovereign Juſtice. That they had nothing to object againſt the Author of this Book, becauſe he has ſubmitted himſelf to the Judgment of his Biſhop; and becauſe it appears by a Writing which he has publiſhed, that he has retracted ſome of thoſe Propoſitions which had advanced, and explained the reſt in ſuch a manner as frees them from all ſuſpition of Error; that they are willing to believe, that the Faults which Monſieur *Ellies Du Pin* fell into, and which deſerved the Cenſure pronounced againſt him, proceeded rather from the greatneſs of the Work which he undertook, than from any formed deſign of introducing new Opinions; and beſides, that there is a great deal of Learning in his Books. That they were obliged to take notice to this Court upon this occaſion, of the care, the application, and vigilauce, which Monſieur the Archbiſhop of *Paris* ſhews to preſerve ſound Doctrine in his Dioceſe, and to ſtiffle every thing in the beginning which may diſturb the Peace and Tranquility of the Church. And therefore that they could omit nothing in thoſe Stations in which they had the Honour to be placed, that was neceſſary to ſecond ſuch good Deſigns; upon which account they were obliged to demand of this Court, that thoſe Books, which the Archbiſhop had condemned, might be ſuppreſſed, and that all Bookſellers ſhould be forbidden to ſell them, till they ſhall be Corrected according to the Writing of the ſaid *Du Pin*, annexed to Monſieur the Archbiſhop's Cenſure; and that the Corrections ſhall have been approved by him. The King's Learned Council withdrawing, the Matter was taken into deliberation, and the Court did forbid all Bookſellers, and others, to ſell or keep by them any Copies of the ſaid Books, which have hitherto been Printed. And it was ordered, that they ſhould be brought forthwith into the Office of this Court to be ſuppreſſed, with very expreſs Prohibitions to all Perſons to Reprint that Book in any manner whatſoever for the time to come, without the Advice and Conſent of the Archbiſhop of *Paris*. Given by the Parliament of *Paris* the 25. of *April* 1693. Signed *Dongois* with his Seal.

FINIS.

SOngs and Airs ſet by Dr. *Blow*, Mr. *Henry Purſel*, Mr. *James Hart*, Mr. *William Turner*, Mr. *Mich. Wiſe*, and ſeveral other Eminent Maſters. *Octavo.*

New Leſſons for Viols or Violins, by ſundry Compoſers of Muſick. *Octavo.*

The Snake in the Graſs, or Satan transformed to an Angel of Light, diſcovering the deep and unſuſpected Subtilties of the *Quakers.* Octavo.

The Caſe of the *Quakers* relating to Oaths ſtated; price 6 *d.* *Quarto.*

The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, as it has been lately Eſtabliſhed in the Kingdom of *Scotland*, examined and diſproved by the Hiſtory, Records and publick Tranſactions of that Nation. *Octavo.*

A Geographical Dictionary in *Folio.* Price 12 *s.*

The plain dealing *Poulterer*, or the *Poulterer*'s Shop opened, with all ſorts of Ware. Price 4 *d.*

Biſhop *Ken*'s Letter concerning *Lent.* Price 1 *d.*

——Manual of Prayers for *Wincheſter*-College, with his Hymns at the end of it. Price 1 *s.*

The *Portugueſe Aſia*, or the Hiſtory and Conqueſts of *India* by the *Portugueſe*, in three Volumes in Octavo. Price 14 *s.*

Whear's method of Reading Hiſtories in *Engliſh*; to which is added a Preface by Mr *Henry Dodwell.* Octavo.

The Political Laſt Teſtament of Monſieur *John Baptiſt Colbert*, late Miniſter and Secretary of State to *Lewis* XIV. Wherein is an account of all that hath paſſed under the Reign of that King, unto the year 1684. With Remarks upon the Government of the King-

Kingdom of *France*: Translated out of the *French*, and Premiſed with the Life of Monſieur *Colbert*; and a Chronological Table of the Dates which are chiefly wanting, by Mr. *Bernard*. Octavo. Price 4 *s*.

The Planters Manual; being Inſtructions for the Raiſing, Planting, and Cultivating all ſorts of Fruit-Trees, whether Stone-Fruits or Pepin-Fruits, with their Natures and Seaſons; very uſeful for ſuch as are Curious in Planting and Grafting: by *Charles Cotton*, Eſq; Octavo.

A Paraphraſe upon the Pſalms of *David*; by *Samuel Woodford*, D. D. The ſecond Edition Corrected by the Author. Octavo.

A Paraphraſe upon the Canticles, and ſome Select Hymns of the New and Old Teſtament, with other occaſional Compoſitions in *Engliſh* Verſe: by *Samuel Woodford*, D. D. Octavo.

The Commentaries of Meſſire *Blaize de Montluc*, of *France*; Wherein are Deſcrib'd all the Combats, Rencounters, Skirmiſhes, Battles, Sieges, Aſſaults, Scalado's, the Taking and Surprizes of Towns and Fortreſſes; as alſo the Defences of the Aſſaulted and Beſieged: With ſeveral other Signal and Remarkable Feats of War, wherein this great and renowned Warriour was perſonally engaged, in the ſpace of fifty or threeſcore Years that he bore Arms under ſeveral Kings of *France*. Together with Divers Inſtructions, that ſuch ought not to be ignorant of, as propoſe to themſelves by the practice of Arms to arrive at any eminent degree of Honor, and prudently to carry on all the Exploints of War. Folio.

BOOKS lately Printed for W. Keblewhite, *at the* Swan *in St.* Paul's *Church Yard.*

IMpar Conatui or Mr. *J. B.* the Author of an Anſwer to the Animadverſions on the Dean of St. *Paul*'s Vindication of the Trinity, Rebuk'd and proved to be wholly unfit for the Great Work he hath undertaken; with ſome account of the late Scandalous Animadverſions on Mr. *Hill*'s Book, Intituled a Vindication of the Primitive Fathers againſt the Imputations of *Gilbert* Lord Biſhop of *Sarum*, &c. By *Thomas Holdſworth*, M. A. Rector of *North Stoneham*, near *Southampton*. Quarto.

A Plain and Rational Vindication of the Liturgy of the Church of *England*, together with an Explanation of the Terms, Order and Uſefulneſs of it, Collected from the Diſcourſes of ſome of the Reverend Biſhops and Doctors of the ſame Church: by *John Clutterbuck*, Gent. Octavo.

The neceſſity of a preſent Repentance, in a Sermon preached before the Right Honorable the Lord Mayor, and Aldermen of *London*, at *Guild-Hall* Chappel, *March* 10. 169⅞. By *William Bramſton*, Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majeſty. Quarto.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worſhip of God; by the Right Reverend Father in God, *William* Lord Biſhop of *London Derry*. The third Edition. Octavo.

An Admonition to the Diſſenters of the Dioceſs of *Derry*, concerning a Book lately publiſhed by Mr. *J. Boyſe*, Entituled Remarks on a late Diſcourſe of *William* Lord Biſhop of *Derry*, concerning the Invention of Men in the Worſhip of God, from *William* Lord Biſhop of the ſaid Dioceſs. Octavo.